REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims:

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are currently pending in the application.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Thus, entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 would be pending.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 & § 103

Claims 1, 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ouchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,829,398). Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi in view of Suyama et al. (US Patent No. 6,055,255).

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an arrangement including a laser array having a first surface emitting laser that emits a beam light and a second surface emitting laser that emits a diffused light. When a signal is to be sent to one receiving element, the first surface emitting laser is used. On the other hand, when a signal is to be simultaneously sent to a plurality of receiving elements, the second surface emitting laser is used. Such an arrangement, for example, provide for decreased power consumption as well as high-speed signal transmission.

As previously argued, Ouchi discloses that light can be transmitted in all direction in an optical waveguide sheet. However, Ouchi does not at all mention the idea

about the above-described beam light propagation and diffused light propagation. Ouchi uses beam light propagation. In this case, however, when a signal is transmitted to multiple receivers, multiple beams have to be emitted in order that multiple receivers simultaneously receive the signal from a transmitter, since the emitting portion of the transmitter and the receivers are brought into one-to-one correspondence. As a result, energy consumption increases. In contrast thereto, as claimed, a diffused light propagation can be used in such case, which allows correspondence between the emitting portion and multiple receivers (one-to-multiple correspondence). Thus, for example, a signal can be transmitted with minimum power. Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Ouchi is silent with respect to diffused light propagation.

Suyama et al. discloses that radiation angle is preferably made constant, and hence does not teach actively changing radiation angle. Suyama et al. does not assume the condition where multiple receivers simultaneously receive a signal, and hence does not have the idea of actively changing radiation angle.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, individually or in combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5254.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: 7/6/06

By: _____

James Hwa
Reg. No.: 42,680
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101